

**REMARKS**

All of the claims were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Proulx (5,807,462) in view of Groff et al. (4,288,463) and Mize et al. (4,186,239). This rejection is respectfully traversed for all of the reasons set forth at length in Applicant's response dated September 22, 2005 to the last Office Action and the Declaration of the Inventor, Richard A. Proulx, filed in support of that response. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his position in view of those arguments. The claims were also rejected under double patenting in view of a second Proulx Patent No. 5,814,176 in addition to the same art. It is respectfully submitted that for the same reason that the obviousness rejection is not well founded, the double patenting rejection should also be withdrawn. Despite the traverses of these rejections, Applicant is presently filing a continuation application so that the claims can be amended to more particularly emphasize the process of the present application as opposed to the product and its intended use. Nevertheless, it is believed that the claims in their present condition adequately define inventive subject matter that are not made obvious by the manipulation of bread dough

during extrusion in the absence of any teaching that it is possible to twist molten monofilament during extrusion to produce the desired shape.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

Dated: MAY 4, 2006

633 West Fifth Street, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071-2040  
Telephone: (213) 896-2400  
Facsimile: (213) 896-2450  
E-mail: PTdocketing@hklaw.com  
Customer No. 34261

OCT2004

# 3761271\_v1

By

  
Richard E. Lyon, Jr.  
Registration No. 26,300  
Attorneys for Applicant